

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. The amendment of claim 5 is clearly supported by the description of page 3, lines 18-25 and Table 1 at page 22 in the instant specification. New claim 6 has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

*(1) Claims 1, 3, and 4 are rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Saito (US 2003/0110803 A1).*

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Saito fails to disclose all of the elements as set forth and arranged in the claims.

According to the present claims, the chemical treatment is performed for the mirror-polished glass substrate to remove at least a part of the polishing-affected layer which is formed on the principal surface of the glass substrate in the mirror-polishing step. Thereafter, the texture is formed by the tape on the principal surface of the glass substrate.

As described on page 5, lines 24-28, and page 6, lines 1-27, in the instant specification, in the mirror-polishing step, the polishing-affected layer is formed on the polishing surface of the glass disk.

Accordingly, if the texturing is carried out after the mirror-polishing step, a desired uniform texture shape is difficult to obtain because the ease of texturing is different between the portion having the relatively high residual stress and another portion having the relatively low residual stress. Specifically, in the portion having the relatively high residual stress, texturing is relatively difficult. In another portion having the relatively low residual stress, texturing is relatively easy. From this reason, the unevenness in texture shape occurs on the principal surface of the glass substrate after the texturing step.

In order to solve the above-noted problems, after the mirror-polishing step, the chemical treatment is carried out so as to remove at least a part of the polishing-affected layer on the

principal surface of the glass disk, which layer is formed in the polishing step. Thus, it is possible to obtain a desired uniform texture shape by performing the texturing step.

Saito may teach the formation of the texture on the polished surface of the glass disk using the texturing tape. However, Saito fails to disclose or teach the above-mentioned feature, i.e., "the chemical treatment is performed for the mirror-polished glass substrate to remove at least a part of the polishing-affected layer which is formed on the principal surface of the glass substrate in the mirror-polishing step and thereafter, the texture is formed by the tape on the principal surface of the glass substrate".

Further, Saito fails to recognize or teach the above-mentioned problems, i.e., "the polishing-affected layer is formed on the principal surface of the glass disk in the mirror-polishing step so that it is difficult to a desired uniform texture shape" and "the unevenness in texture shape occurs on the principal surface of the glass substrate after the texturing step" and, therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art following the teachings of Saito would not have come up with the presently claimed invention.

As discussed above, the present invention recited in the above-amended claim 1 is different from Saito, and therefore, is not anticipated by Saito. Likewise, the dependent claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated by Saito.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*(2) Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (US 2003/0110803 A1).*

As noted above, Saito is deficient. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Saito to include the use of sodium hydroxide, potassium hydroxide, and or ammonium fluoride in a chemical treatment step, as in claim 2, and to include a step of forming a magnetic layer upon the as fabricated glass disk, as in claim 5. However, neither such modification cures the above-noted deficiency in Saito.

Accordingly, even assuming that one of ordinary skill in the art were to modify Saito as suggested by the Examiner, any such modification would still not include all of the elements as claimed. Accordingly, Saito fails to render obvious the dependent claims 2 and 5.

**New Claim**

New claim 6 has been added, and is clearly supported by the description of page 19, lines 23-28 and Table 1 at page 22 in the instant specification.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

 #41,574  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alan J. Kasper

Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 11, 2007